5/20/70

Howard (Dick),

If anything was needed to remove any possibility of integrity on Nichols' part, it is the picture you sent and I will today forward to Dick. It is as close as possible a duplication of mine as there could be, and this John promised not to do as a condition of seeing my material. I have not taken the time to make a side-by-side comparison for even that short time I do not now have.

Much the same is true of the Archives' integrity. It has been a long time since I asked for this picture, months since they gave me the wrong one in pretended response, and they have not yet sent it to me. I think at this point I'll not ask again if Dick will let me have this copy, after he makes copies, as he can get done very reasonably. I would ask that Dick have his copy enlarged to a maximum width of 4 3/4 inches, which is the longer dimension in the enlargement I have, and we can then make a more exact comparison. However, I am confident that at the time the Nichols picture was taken, 5/63, the bullet was identically the same as when the picture was taken for me the year earlier. The laceration visible to me was made later than the Nichols picture, I believe.

If they send me a print, then I'll also return this one to Dick. But this one has Johnson's handwriting on the back identifying it. To me they have said they cannot locate and identify the picture, and ,ong ago I offered to go in and go over their negatives and tell them which one it is. No response. Even if they now send me a copy, - can establish discrimination in court. Therefore, your correspondence is also important in a suit. And I am preparing the suit(s).

I look forward to seeing the missing fragment. If and when you can, I think you should also get a picture of the other long projections. I think we should be able to know how the piece fit 399 and whether, in fact, it did fall out when theyx were photographing for Thompson or whether it was later removed. However, either way, they are done on two scores: Thompson's was taken before mine. There is not nearly enough missing from mine. Therefore, the bullet can't possible have the history attributed to it and everyone involved had to have known it. The other factor is their inability to preserve the evidence in safety or even in pristine condition. You may recall, one of their reasons for refusing access to some of the evidence is to preserve it. They even argued this in the suit for Garrison and in their answer to Nichols' papers a year ago. So, this and the other missing things are either conspiratorial or remain a destruction of their basic arguments in refusing things. I read your letter yesterday just before leaving for Baltimore and can't take the time to reread it now. I recall references to other disappeared stuff. I'll be filing that separately when I turn the copy machine on for other work. I'll be filing this in two pieces, under Archives suits on the material generally and under a seperate file I'M making for my separate Spectre suit, the preliminaries to which are completed.

You said you have no projector. I have a second one, old but the last time I used it quite good-and not nearly as old as the WWII one I do use. You can borrow it and, if you like it, can own it for whatever you think it is worth. However, the loan can be indefinite, for when you buy one you may want an automatic one, which this one isn't. This one, however, takes 35mm slides and 2¼x2¼, which is very rare and has a big advantage in that you can make slides with a reflex camera and use them, much larger slides, thus much clearer image.

I made a few notes on your letter as I read it. On Fred and telling him what I suggested, - noted"Right", for your decision to ignore my advice was correct. Meanwhile, it appears that by correspondence with the clerk of the court I am gradually getting into a position to represent myself in a suit against Skol.

I think it is, now only a matter of time.

You are also correct on my not recalling the exact words of the aut. report on LaD. That fits Dick's argument even better.

In fact, as I now think of it, what would be better would be if you went over this 5/25 letter when you have time and write me seperately about each missing item, giving the history, if it is no burden with copies of the letters establishing it, staple each item together yourself so you can later identify it, and I'll file it for the relevant suit. Then, perhaps aside from being my research assistent, you can also be a witness in refutation of their basic argument and to establish that they are incompetent to preserve the simplest things with safety and security.

I'll be even busier now. I've not even been able to keep the grass cut or to get the swimming pool ready for use. Yesterday I had aconference with the judge and federal attorney in Baltimore over our long-delayed civil action against the government on the helicopter damages. I am now my own attorney in this matter, and it is an important and technical one. I must give it considerable time and priority. I hope only that before I have to get it in shape I'll be able to file those suits I've been working on. After filing, they can wait until there is time to have them heard. The filing will do enough shaking up.

Mostly,